



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/113,747	07/10/1998	ANDREA BASSO	1-3-66-7	8396
26652	7590	02/16/2006	EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP. P.O. BOX 4110 MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748			BUI, KIEU OANH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/113,747	Applicant(s) BASSO ET AL	
	Examiner KIEU-OANH T. BUI	Art Unit 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-17, 19-20, 22-30, 33-39, 41-48, and 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goetz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,928,330/ or "Goetz" hereinafter) in view of Vrvilo et al (US Patent 5,794,018).

Regarding claim 1, Goetz discloses "a computer-readable medium storing instructions adapted to be executed on a processor, to: (a) display, at a receiver, received data; (b) analyze, at the receiver, the quality of the displayed data; (c) formulate, at the receiver and based on the analysis in step (b), a media-parameter suggestion for an encoder to alter the characteristics of data to be sent to the receiver, and (d) send, from the receiver, the formulated suggestion", i.e., Goetz discloses a multimedia distribution system to a client i.e., a receiver such as a PC with a display monitor (see abstract and col. 10/lines 37-63) and as being a computer readable medium for storing instructions (as illustrated from Figs. 1-7), from a server 920 (as illustrated in Fig. 9) wherein the multimedia files can be streaming accordingly or adjusting appropriately according to network's characteristics (col. 4/lines 34-54) or to user's preferences (col. 8/lines 40-50) the client or the user can change or alter the characteristics of data to be sent to him/her by suggesting or requesting some parameter suggestions, for example, changing the desired rate of

Art Unit: 2611

transmission between the user's device and the server for receiving multimedia files (col. 11/lines 27-48), and the formulated suggestion or user requests for quality presentations can be obtained by sending the requests to the server, and the server sends the requested data to the user terminal (col. 3/lines 1-35; Figs. 10 & 11, and col. 10/line 64 to col. 12/line 13 for details on procedures for the client how to request quality presentations being displayed on the client's device from the server).

Applicants argue that Goetz does not “analyzing the quality of displaying data at the receiver” and formulating the suggestion or request to the sender; however, such a same technique is taught by Vrvilo as Vrvilo, in a same field of network-based environment, teaches that the display format or the presentation at the display to the viewer can be changed by the viewer based on their requests as different display formats and different video (display) rates can be alternatively presented (Vrvilo, refer to Fig. 34 for steps of managing multiple media applications, col. 38/line 62 to col. 40/line 65 for details on multiple video formats and different video display resolution; col. 42/line 39 to col. 43/line 27 for the quality of video/audio presentation is affected by video formats and options and the capability in optimizing video performance of the system—quality of the displayed image—addressed; and Figs. 38 as an example for rate negotiation from the user for different rate/quality streams). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Goetz's system with Vrvilo's teaching technique of requesting the display of presentation data as the quality of displaying data is of concern.

As for claim 2, Goetz discloses "the storing instructions adapted to be executed on a processor to: (e) receive, at the receiver, a user preference to be used in the analysis in step (b)", i.e., user preferences are used for opening presentations at the user terminal based on the earlier

As for claim 3, Goetz further discloses "wherein the instruction (a) to display data includes instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to display, at the receiver, audiovisual data", i.e., audiovisual data or multimedia data is addressed (col. 1/lines 25-38).

As for claim 4, Goetz teaches "wherein the instruction (b) to analyze the quality of the displayed data includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to analyze, at the receiver, the system load", i.e., the system load or system capacity is of concern for an effective solution as the object of this system (col. 2/lines 26-55).

As for claim 6, Goetz further teaches the step of "wherein the instruction c) to formulate a media-parameter suggestion includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to formulate media-parameter suggestions that include: (I) send timing information identifying the point in time where the data was collected; and (ii) send timing information identifying the point in time when the suggested action should be honored" by disclosing the timing information must be provided in order to provide the synchronization for the transmission of multimedia stream (col. 1/line 58 to col. 2/line 14).

As for claim 7, Goetz further discloses "wherein the instruction c) to formulate a mediaparameter suggestion includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to formulate media-parameter suggestions to: (I) alter the frame rate", i.e., different frame rates can be requested and performed (col. 8/lines 40-50; col. 10/lines 18-35; col. I 1/lines 27-48).

As for claims 9, 22, 32, 41, and 50, in further view of claim 1 above, Vrvilo further teaches the step of "alter the window size" in the media-parameter suggestion as an instruction to change (col. 42/line 39 to col. 43/line 27 as resizing the window changes the quality of the display presentation).

As for claim 10, Goetz shows the step of "wherein the instruction c) to formulate a media-parameter suggestion includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to formulate media-parameter suggestions to: (I) alter audio channel characteristics", i.e., language or rate of audio can be changed (col. 6/lines 10-30).

As for claim 11, Goetz further discloses the step of "wherein the instruction c) to formulate a media-parameter suggestion includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to formulate media-parameter suggestions to: (I) alter the graphics hardware load", i.e., the graphics hardware load or the graphics presentations to viewers can be changed, i.e., multiple copies can be sent (col. 10/lines 18-35).

As for claim 12, Goetz discloses "wherein the instruction c) to formulate a mediaparameter suggestion includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to formulate media-parameter suggestions to: (I) alter the CPU load", i.e., the CPU load or the system capacity can be altered (col. 2/lines 35-55).

As for claim 13, Goetz further disclose "wherein the instruction c) to formulate a mediaparameter suggestion includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to formulate media-parameter suggestions that include: (I) altering the RAM amount available", i.e., a RAM is addressed for storing packets containing multimedia information (col. 7/lines 19-39).

Regarding claims 14-17, 19-20 and 22-26, these claims for "a method of transmitting data from a sender to a receiver across a network comprising: (a) displaying, at the receiver, received data; (b) analyzing, at the receiver, the quality of the displayed data; c) formulating, at the receiver and based on the analysis in step (b), a media-parameter suggestion for an encoder to alter the characteristics of data to be sent to the receiver; and (d) sending, from the receiver, the formulated suggestion to alter the quality of the received data" with same limitations as earlier cited are rejected for the reasons given in the scope of claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-13 as already disclosed in details in view of Vrvilo as discussed above.

Regarding claims 27-30 and 33-35, these claims for "a method for transmitting data across a network comprising: a) transmitting data to a receiver; b) receiving a suggestion to alter the transmitted data on the basis of a quality of data transmitted in (a); c) selecting, based on the received suggestion, an action to alter the data; and d) altering the transmitted data" with same limitations as earlier cited are rejected for the reasons given in the scope of claims 1-4, 6-7 and 10-13 as already disclosed in details in view of Vrvilo as discussed above.

Regarding claims 36-39 and 41-45, these claims for "an apparatus for transmitting data from a sender to a receiver across a network comprising: (a) a processor; (b) a port coupled to said processor; and c) a memory coupled to said processor and said port, storing instructions adapted to be run on said processor to: (i) display, at the receiver, received data; (ii) analyze, at the receiver, the quality of the displayed data; (iii) formulate, at the receiver and based on the analysis in (ii), a media-parameter suggestion for an encoder to alter the characteristics of data to be sent to the receiver; and (iv) send, from the receiver, the formulated suggestion to alter the quality of the received data" with a host interface as a port for interfacing to other components of

Art Unit: 2611

the network (Fig. 10/item 920 and Fig. 11) and with same limitations as earlier cited are rejected for the reasons given in the scope of claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-13 as already disclosed in details in view of Vrvilo as discussed above.

Regarding claim 46-48 and 50-53, these claims for "an apparatus for transmitting data from a sender to a receiver across a network comprising: (a) a processor; (b) a port coupled to said processor; and c) a memory coupled to said processor and said port, storing instructions adapted to be run on said processor to: (i) transmit data to a receiver; (ii) receive a suggestion to alter the transmitted data on the basis of a quality of data transmitted in (i); and (iii) selecting, based on the received suggestion, an action to alter the data; and (iv) altering the transmitted data" with a host interface as a port for interfacing to other components of the network (Fig. 10/item 920) and with same limitations as earlier cited are rejected for the reasons given in the scope of claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-13 as in details in view of Vrvilo as discussed above.

3. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goetz et al (US Patent No. 5,928,330) in view of Vrvilo et al. (US Patent 5,794,018) as described above and Pocock et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,014,125).

As for claims 5 and 18, Goetz and McCoy do not further disclose the detailed components of the client receiver as claimed; however, Pocock shows "wherein the instruction (b) to analyze the quality of the displayed data includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to: (i) analyze, at the receiver, component load, wherein a component is chosen from the set comprising a central-processing unit, a graphics card, and a texture-mapping engine" (Fig. 4/item 94 for a CPU; Fig. 4/item 86 for video processor and Fig. 5/item 118 for a graphics

Art Unit: 2611

generator (within a graphics card); and col. 8/line 61 to col. 9/line 14 for a method of creating commands with alphanumeric keys in commands as a texture-mapping engine). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Goetz's and Vrvilo's system with well-known and must-have features of a PC such as a CPU, a graphics card and a texture-mapping engine as one of Pocock's in order to perform the mentioned activities or analyzing the quality of displayed data as noted.

4. Claims 8, 21, 31, 40, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goetz et al (US Patent No. 5,928,330) in view of Vrvilo as described above and Volk et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,401/ or "Volk" hereinafter).

Regarding claims 8, 21, 31, 40, and 49, Goetz and Vrvilo do not show the computer readable medium as of claim 2 wherein the instruction c) to formulate a media parameter suggestion includes instructions adapted to be run on the processor to formulate media-parameter suggestions to: "alter the color depth"; however, Volk teaches the same technique of providing interactive two-way multimedia information data to users. In fact, Volk teaches an enhanced user interface that allows users to customize the control item via a user input device (Volk, col. 5/line 20-60). Volk clearly teaches an enhanced technique of altering the color depth using the user interface at the user terminal (col. 18/lines 10-30; and col. 33/lines 45-55 for altering the "color depth"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Goetz's and Vrvilo's interactive multimedia presentation system with Volk's teaching technique of altering the color depth as additional tool for customizing the user interface as revealed by Volk as preferred.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/29/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Applicants mainly and focus on the combination of references of Goetz and Vrvilo for most of the arguments but not clearly point out what would be the novelty of the claiming features of present claims.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as noted from the examiner, the three criteria are met as follows.

First (first criteria), both references are for network-based environment with clients and server communication (Goetz, Fig. 9 and Vrvilo, col. 42/lines 47-65 for the host processor within the host system and the local monitor display for clients). The conference system (as argued by the applicants) is simply a network based system for data streams communications and multimedia applications/services but in a narrow scale of a particular application, i.e., conferencing for a plurality of clients/users within the system; in other words, the clients and the server still communicate to each other in addition to the exchange of information among clients/users.

Secondly (second criteria), there is a reasonable expectation of success because both references are aiming to achieve the quality of presentation/display at the client/user terminal (i.e., Goetz, col. 4/lines 33-54 and Vrvilo, col. 42/lines 39-65). Both are aiming for the common goal to achieve high quality display/resolution at the client/user terminal.

Finally (third criteria), the prior art of Goetz and Vrvilo teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations as disclosed in details in the office action above.

Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants' arguments on the combination issue of Goetz and Vrvilo and stands with the rejection on all grounds as previously disclosed and now discussed in this final office action, not limited to the cited paragraphs quoted above by the examiner but also to the entire disclosure and teaching of Goetz and Vrvilo references.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to PTO New Central Fax number:

(571) 273-8300, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

*Hand deliveries must be made to Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (571) 272-7291. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Bui', with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Kieu-Oanh Bui
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2611

KB
Feb. 08, 2006